

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

CHARLES B. JACKSON, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. CV 19-767 JCH/CG

CITY OF LAS CRUCES, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiff's *Motion for Appointment of Counsel*, (Doc. 8). There is no right to appointment of counsel in a civil rights case. Instead, the decision whether to request assistance of counsel rests in the sound discretion of the Court. *Beaudry v. Corrections Corp. of America*, 331 F.3d 1164, 1169 (10th Cir. 2003); *MacCuish v. United States*, 844 F.2d 733, 735 (10th Cir. 1988). In determining whether to appoint counsel, the district court should consider the merits of the litigant's claims, the nature and complexity of the factual and legal issues, and the litigant's ability to investigate the facts and to present his claims. *Hill v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.*, 393 F.3d 1111, 1115 (10th Cir. 2004).

The Court has reviewed the complaint and subsequent filings in light of the foregoing factors. Plaintiff appears to understand the issues in the case and to be representing himself in an intelligent and capable manner. See *Lucero v. Gunter*, 52 F.3d 874, 878 (10th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, Plaintiff's *Motion for Appointment of Counsel*, (Doc. 8), is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



THE HONORABLE CARMEN E. GARZA  
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE